

**Joseph M. Alioto**, SBN #42680,

*Admitted Pro hac vice*

jmalimoto@aliotolaw.com

**ALIOTO LAW FIRM**

One Sansome Street, 35th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94104

Telephone: (415) 434-8900

Facsimile: (415) 434-9200

**Christopher L. Cauble**, OSB No. 962374

ccauble@thecaublefirm.com

**Rachele R. Selvig**, OSB No. 095016

rselvig@thecaublefirm.com

**CAUBLE, CAUBLE & SELVIG, LLP**

111 SE Sixth Street

Grants Pass, OR 97526

Telephone: (541) 476-8825

Facsimile: (541) 471-1704

**[See additional attorneys listed on signature page]**

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**DISTRICT OF OREGON**

**MEDFORD DIVISION**

**JAMES DEHOOG, et al.;**

Case No. 1:15-cv-02250-CL

Plaintiffs;

v.

**PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF APPEAL**

**ANHEUSER-BUSCH INBEV, SA/NV and  
SABMILLER PLC;**

Defendants.

**Judge Ann L. Aiken**

Notice is hereby given under Fed. R. App. P. 3 that all Plaintiffs, JAMES DEHOOG, BRIAN BOUTELLER, SHONNA BOUTELLER, CARLY BOWEN, TOM BUTTERBAUGH, ERICA I. CORONA, MARIA G. CORONA, CHRIS DENNETT, JOHN DESBIENS, MATTHEW JOHNSON, CYNTHIA A. KREITZBERG, EDWARD LAWRENCE, JERUSHA MALAER, ROBERT MALAER, MICHAEL MARTIN, MICHAEL MCATEE, DAVID MILLIGAN, JEFF REEDER, RALPH REEDER, WADE SCAGLIONE, BETH H. SILVERS, BRADLEY O. SILVERS and PATRICE WADE, hereby appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit from the final Order and Judgment of the United States District Court for the District of Oregon, granting Defendants' Motions to Dismiss, and adopting the Findings and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, dated October 3, 2016. (Dkt. Nos. 112 and 113).

**DATED** this 2nd day of November, 2016.

**ALIOTO LAW FIRM**

/s/ Joseph M. Alioto

**Joseph M. Alioto**, SBN #42680, *Pro hac vice*  
[jmalieto@aliotolaw.com](mailto:jmalieto@aliotolaw.com)

**CAUBLE, CAUBLE & SELVIG, LLP**  
**Christopher L. Cauble**, OSB No. 962374  
[ccauble@thecaublefirm.com](mailto:ccauble@thecaublefirm.com)  
**Rachele R. Selvig**, OSB No. 095016  
[rselvig@thecaublefirm.com](mailto:rselvig@thecaublefirm.com)

**MESSINA LAW FIRM, P.C.**  
**Gil D. Messina**, NJ #029661978, *Pro hac vice*  
[gmessina@messinalawfirm.com](mailto:gmessina@messinalawfirm.com)  
961 Holmdel Road  
Holmdel, NJ 07733  
732-332-9300 Phone/732-332-9301 Fax

**SEVERAID & GLAHN, P.C.**

**Ronald H. Severaid**, SBN #78923, *Pro hac vice*  
rhseveraid@sbcglobal.net

**Carter Glahn**, SBN #242378, *Pro hac vice*  
sandglaw-mail@yahoo.com

1787 Tribute Rd., Suite D  
Sacramento, CA 95815  
916-929-8383 Phone/916-925-4763 Fax

**LAW OFFICES OF JEFFERY K. PERKINS**

**Jeffery K. Perkins**, SBN #57996, *Pro hac vice pending*  
jefferykperkins@aol.com

1550-G Tiburon Blvd., #344  
Tiburon, CA 94920  
415-302-1115 Phone/415-435-4053 Fax

**LARSON O'BRIEN LLP**

**Steven A. Haskins**, CSB #238865, *Pro hac vice*

**Stephen G. Larson**, CSB #145225, *Pro hac vice*  
shaskins@larsonobrienlaw.com

slarson@larsonobrienlaw.com  
555 South Flower Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
212-436-4888 Phone/213-323-2000 Fax

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing was served electronically via the Court's electronic filing system on the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of November, 2016, according to this Court's provision for service and sent to the following counsel of record indicated below:

Michael G. Hanlon  
LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL G. HANLON, P.C.  
101 S.W. Main Street, Suite 825  
Portland, OR 97204  
Tel: 503-228-9787  
Fax: 503-224-4200  
mgh@hanlonlaw.com

J. Robert Robertson (*Pro hac vice*)  
Benjamin F. Holt (*Pro hac vice*)  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
555 Thirteenth St, NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
Tel: 202-637-5774  
Fax: 202-637-5910  
robby.robertson@hoganlovells.com  
benjamin.holt@hoganlovells.com

*Attorneys for SABMILLER plc*

J. Matthew Donohue  
Shannon L. Armstrong  
MARKOWITZ HERBOLD PC  
1211 SW Fifth Ave, Suite 3000  
Portland OR 97204-3730  
mattdonohue@markowitzherbold.com  
shannonarmstrong@mhgm.com  
Tel: 503-295-3085  
Fax: 503-323-9105

Lillian S. Grossbard (*Pro hac vice*)  
Yonatan Even (*Pro hac vice*)  
Greg C. Cheyne (*Pro hac vice*)  
CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE, LLP  
Worldwide Plaza  
825 Eighth Avenue  
New York, NY 10019-7475  
lgrossbard@cravath.com  
yeven@cravath.com  
gcheyne@cravath.com  
Tel: 212-474-1000  
Fax: 212-474-3700

*Attorneys for Defendant Anheuser-Busch  
InBev, SA/NV*

DATED this 2nd day of November, 2016.

**ALIOTO LAW FIRM**

/s/ Joseph M. Alioto  
**Joseph M. Alioto**, SBN #42680, *Pro hac vice*  
[jmalieto@aliotolaw.com](mailto:jmalieto@aliotolaw.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON  
MEDFORD DIVISION

JAMES DEHOOG, ET AL.,  
Plaintiffs,

1:15-cv-02250-CL

v.

**ORDER**

ANHEUSER-BUSCH INBEV, SA/NV;  
SABMILLER, PLC,  
Defendants.

---

**AIKEN, District Judge:**

On July 22, 2016, Magistrate Judge Mark D. Clarke filed a Findings and Recommendation (#102), and the matter is now before this Court. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B), Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). Plaintiffs have filed Objections (#106), Defendants have responded to Plaintiffs' Objections (##108, 109) and I have reviewed the file of this case *de novo*. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); McDonnell

Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Bus. Mach., Inc., 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981).

I have given this matter *de novo* review. I find no error. Accordingly, I ADOPT the Findings and Recommendation. Defendants' Motions to Dismiss (##41, 43) are GRANTED.


I turn then to the question of amendment. Dismissal without leave to amend is appropriate where amendment would be futile. Lipton v. Pathogenesis Corp., 284 F.3d 1027, 1039 (9th Cir. 2002). After reviewing the Complaint, briefing, and the exhibits submitted by both parties, I conclude that any amendment would be futile, particularly in light of the Ninth Circuit's ruling in a factually-similar case, Edstrom v. Anheuser-Busch InBev, 647 F. App'x 733 (9th Cir. 2016). In Edstrom, the court held that "[t]o establish a prima facie case, a Section 7 plaintiff generally must show that the challenged transaction would increase the concentration of firms in the relevant market." Id. at 735. The Ninth Circuit noted that the challenged transaction in Edstrom did not "increase ABI's market share or the concentration of the U.S. beer market," and found that the plaintiffs "failed to plausibly allege that the challenged transaction is anti-competitive." Id.

Plaintiffs in this case, like those in Edstrom, cannot plausibly allege that the challenged transaction will increase either ABI's market share or the concentration of firms in the U.S. beer market. Aside from the complete divestiture of SAB's interest in MillerCoors, which was discussed at length by Judge

Clarke, Plaintiffs' own exhibits show that the Department of Justice has reached a settlement with ABI and SAB which will prevent increased concentration in the U.S. beer industry. Alioto Decl. Ex. B, at 1.

Accordingly, dismissal shall be with prejudice. Any outstanding motions are DENIED as moot.

It is so ORDERED and DATED this 30<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2016.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ann Aiken", is written over a horizontal line.

ANN AIKEN  
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON  
MEDFORD DIVISION

JAMES DEHOOG, ET Al.,  
Plaintiffs,

1:15-cv-02250-CL

v.

**JUDGMENT**

ANHEUSER-BUSCH INBEV,  
SA/NV; SABMILLER, PLC,  
Defendants.

---

**AIKEN, District Judge:**

For the reasons set forth in the Findings and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Clarke (#102) and my accompanying Order, Defendants' Motions to Dismiss (##41, 43) are GRANTED. This case is dismissed with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 3 day of October, 2016.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ANN AIKEN  
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE